



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/070,545	06/04/2002	Helge Myklebust	2810-17	4723

23117 7590 05/13/2005

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

SMITH, TERRI L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3762

DATE MAILED: 05/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/070,545

Applicant(s)

MYKLEBUST ET AL.

Examiner

Terri L. Smith

Art Unit

3762

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 June 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/7/02, 1/10/03
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The information disclosure statement filed March 7, 2002 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because the lined through reference does not have a date. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609 ¶ C(1).

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On pages 1 and 15, changing "Near" to "Nearly" (line 9) and "typical" to "typically" (line 18), respectively, would add clarity to the statements.

On page 7, the phrase "For measuring and ... standard derivation II" (lines 13 – 14) is unclear. In addition, it is unclear what reference number 7 denotes (lines 20 – 22). Does it denote an algorithm for classification of ECG if it is integrated into a defibrillator? Or does it denote a microprocessor system and software if it is integrated into a defibrillator? It is unclear as to what the phrases "if integrated into a defibrillator" (lines 20 – 21) are referring. Are these phrases supposed to dictate what reference number 7 should represent under a given set of conditions?

Art Unit: 3762

On page 8, the phrase “for predict” (line 19) is unclear. It is recommended that the phrase be changed to either “to predict” or “for predicting” to add clarity to the statement.

On pages 9, 10 and 15, changing the phrase “an set” to “a set” (lines 20 – 21; 27 and 29; and line 25, respectively) would clarify the statements. Additionally on page 9, changing “two set” to “two sets” (line 19) would also clarify the statement, and changing “none-“ (line 21) to “non-“ would make the term consistent with its like terms throughout the disclosure.

Further, on page 10, the phrase “For present purpose is the optimized filters ...” (lines 6 – 10) is unclear. It is unclear what is being disclosed by this phrase. Similarly, the phrase “Separation ability is measured ... the increase in performance” (lines 10 – 15) is unclear. It is unclear if the phrase is one or two sentences. It also appears that “nom-ROSC” (line 12) should be “non-ROSC”. Also, the phrase “Spectral measures that are ...” (lines 16 – 17) is unclear. It reads as an incomplete sentence.

On page 11, it is unclear what “I.e.” represents at the end of line 9. Similarly, the last sentence on lines 30 – 33 is unclear.

On page 12, should the equation “ $1=1,2$ ” be changed to “ $i=1,2$ ” (line 23)?

On page 13, it is unclear what “the requirement of generality” is being disclosed as (lines 10 – 16).

On page 15, making the following changes would add clarity to the statements: the plural tense for “calculation” (line 15) and dimension (line 19); “This correspond the” to “This corresponds to the” (line 29). It appears that “sequens” (line 22) is a typographical error; perhaps it should be “sequence”.

Art Unit: 3762

On page 19, making the following changes would add clarity to the statements: “a ECG” to “an ECG”, “consist” to “consists”, “element” to “elements” (all on line 19); “is” (line 27) to “are”. On lines 30 – 33, the phrase “In order to reduce ... have m elements; $m < (n+p)$ ” is confusing. It is unclear what is being disclosed.

Appropriate correction is required.

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant’s use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase “Not Applicable” should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (c) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (d) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (e) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (f) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).

Claim Objections

3. Claims 1 – 14 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 1, it is recommended that “results” be changed to “result”, “shock” be change to “shocks”, and “relative the” be changed to “relative to the” (all on line 14) to add clarity to the claim.

In claims 1 – 14, “A” at the beginning of each claim should be changed to “The” to add clarity to the claims.

Art Unit: 3762

In claims 5 and 10 – 13, the “s” should be deleted from the word “Claims” (line 1 in each claim) because only one claim is being referenced by each claim.

In claim 2, it is recommended that “is” (line 2) be changed to “are” to add clarity to the claim.

In claim 4, it is recommended that “calculation” (line 2) be changed to “calculating” to add clarity to the claim.

In claim 6, “en” (line 7) appears to be a typographical error. Perhaps it should read “in”.

In claim 7, it is recommended that “shock” (line 5) be changed to “shocks” and “a arbitrary” (lines 12 and 18) to “an arbitrary” to add clarity to the claim. Additionally, it appears that “in-dimensional” (lines 15, 16, and 26) should read “m-dimensional” as written in line 23.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1 – 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, the use of the word “wherein” (line 3) is vague. It is an improper transitional phrase and it cannot be determined if the claim is open-ended or closed-ended. Furthermore, “a module” (line 4) and “electrode” (line 5) are inferentially

Art Unit: 3762

included. It cannot be determined if the module and electrode are being positively recited or functionally recited. To positively claim the elements, it is suggested to first positively recite the elements. Otherwise functional language such as “for” or “adapted to be” should be used. Moreover, the phrase “connected to a patient” (line 5) is vague because connection to a patient cannot be claimed. Additionally, the phrase “means of comparing for” (line 10) is inferentially included and it cannot be determined if 35 U.S.C. 112 sixth paragraph is being invoked. Also, the phrase “defibrillator treatments” (line 12) is inferentially included. The word “where” (lines 12 and 13) is vague. Is this supposed to be “wherein” or “whereby”? In addition, the phrase “where there for each combination of parameters is assigned a” (line 12) is vague since it cannot be determined what element is performing the function?

In claim 3, “means of an algorithm” (lines 2 – 3) is inferentially included, unclear and vague. It cannot be determined if 35 U.S.C. 112 sixth paragraph is being invoked.

Claim 4 recites the limitation “the algorithm” in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Furthermore, the phrase “where there” (lines 2 – 3) is vague. It should be “wherein”. Additionally, the phrases “is stored” (line 3), “is determined” (line 4) and “is diverted” (line 5) make the claim incomplete. There is no element set forth for storing, determining, or diverting. Therefore, it is unclear what element is performing these functions. Moreover, “m different signal sequences” (lines 5 – 6) and “m different filters” (line 6) are inferentially included.

In claim 5, the phrases “is diverted” (lines 2 and 4) make the claim incomplete. There is no element set for diverting. Therefore, it is unclear what element is performing this function.

Art Unit: 3762

Claims 6 recites the limitation “the calculation unit” in lines 1 – 3 and 5 and “treatment parameters” in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. In addition, the phrases “a data storage” (line 2), “means for exchange of data” (line 4), “a central computer” (line 5), “algorithm for calculation” (line 6), and “information” (line 7) are all inferentially included. Furthermore, the word “where” (line 5) is vague. Is this supposed to be “wherein” or “whereby”? Moreover, the phrase “is stored” (line 7) is not set forth to store information.

In claim 7, the phrase “there is provided” (line 2) is vague. It is unclear what element is performing this function. Also, is this a “further comprising” limitation? Additionally, the phrase “establishing of an” (line 2) makes the claim incomplete. There is no element set forth to establish and it is unclear if this is a positive limitation. The phrase “iterative search” (line 6) makes the claim incomplete because no element is set forth to iterate and it is unclear if this is a positive limitation. Furthermore, the phrases “information from a number of new patient treatments” (line 3), “information from a number of earlier performed patient treatments” (line 4) and “filter coefficients by m digital filters” (line 6) are inferentially included. Moreover, the phrases “adjusted iterative” (line 7), “performance of a classification” (line 7), “is adjusted iterative” (line 8), and “is defined” (line 9) make the claim incomplete as there are no elements set forth for adjusting, performing, or defining and it is unclear if these are positive limitations. Claim 7 also recites the limitation “the m-dimensional matrix” in line 27. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. In summary, the entire claim is vague and indefinite. The claim does not set forth what elements are being positively

Art Unit: 3762

recited or functionally recited. In addition, the claim does not set forth what elements are performing the functions listed in the claim.

In claim 8, “a receiver” (line 2) is inferentially included. Additionally, the phrase “shape of a display unit” (line 2) is vague. It is unclear what the limitation of “the shape” of a display unit is.

Claim 9 recites the limitation “the receiver” in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 10 recites the limitation “the receiver” in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

In claim 11, “the analysis unit (2)” (line 2) is vague because “(2)” is not used in claim 1. Additionally, “to a receiver” (line 5) is inferentially included. Claim 11 also recites the limitations “the numerical value” in lines 3 – 4, “the positive change” in line 4, “the mean value” in line 4 and “the period” in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim 12 recites the limitations “the receiver” in line 2, “the numerical value” in line 2, “the positive change” in line 2, “the mean value” in line 3, and “the period” in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. Furthermore, “a display” (line 3) is inferentially included.

Claim 13 recites the limitations “the receiver” in line 2, “the numerical value” in line 2, “the positive change” in line 2, “the mean value” in line 3, “the period” in line 3 and “the choice of treatment” in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. In addition, “wherein” (line 1) is vague. It should be “further

Art Unit: 3762

comprising.” Likewise, “the analysis unit (2)” (line 3) is vague because “(2)” is not used in claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office Action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1 – 4 and 6 – 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brown et al., U.S. Patent 5,683,424.

Regarding Claim 1, Brown discloses an analysis unit is connected with a module (Figs. 3 – 4), which is measuring bio-electrical signals from electrodes connected to a patient (Figs. 1 – 2), an analysis unit is provided to organize the bio-electrical signals continuous into segments (Fig. 2; column 5, lines 48 – 52), an analysis unit is provided for each segment to calculate a combination parameter that characterizes the condition of the heart (Fig. 2; column 2, lines 33 – 37; column 6, lines 41 – 44), an analysis unit is provided to by means of comparing for each combination of parameters to find a corresponding combination of parameters from earlier made defibrillator treatments, where there for each combination of parameters is assigned a probability figure, where the probability figure expresses the number of defibrillator shocks that results in ROSC relative to the total number of defibrillator shocks for each combination of parameters

Art Unit: 3762

(column 5, lines 67 –68; column 6, lines 1 – 3; column 7, lines 55 – 59), and an analysis unit has an output for the probability figure (Fig. 3; column 5, lines 54 – 59).

Regarding Claim 2, Brown discloses bio-electrical signals are ECG signals (column 5, line 53).

Regarding Claim 3, Brown discloses an analysis unit is provided to calculate the probability figure by means of an algorithm (Figs. 2 – 3; column 4, lines 22 – 23; column 5, lines 54 – 56).

Regarding Claim 4, Brown discloses an algorithm for calculating a probability figure is a table look up in an m-dimensional table (Fig. 2; column 4, lines 22 – 23; column 8, Table 1; column 9, Table 2), where there for each table element is stored a numerical value for the probability figure (column 7, lines 21 –22), the table look up is determined from the value of an m-dimensional vector, the value of the m-dimensional vector is derived from the calculation of the energy of respective m different signal sequences that are represented on the output of m different digital filters (column 5, lines 34 – 36 and 53 – 54; column 6, lines 58 – 59), where a signal on the input of each digital filter is a segment of an ECG signal (column 5, lines 53 – 54).

Regarding Claim 6, Brown discloses a calculation unit is connected to a data storage (Fig. 2; column 7, lines 21 – 22), the calculation unit is storing for each treatment parameters which describe the patient and parameters which describes the treatment (Figs. 2 and 3; column 6, lines 25 –32), the calculation unit is connected to means for exchange of data, the exchange of data occur on a regular basis towards a central computer (Fig. 3), where the calculation unit receives optimized algorithm for calculation

Art Unit: 3762

of the probability figure (Fig. 3, element 112), and the computer receives information that is stored in the data storage.

Regarding Claim 7, Brown discloses an optimized algorithm by first establishing of an updated set of empirical data consisting of information from a number of new patient treatments together with information from a number of earlier performed patient treatments (column 6, lines 48 – 49), which all contain sequences of ECG where the outcome after shock are known; the optimized algorithm occur by iterative search after filter coefficients by m digital filters, where the filter coefficients are adjusted iterative in view of performance of a classification routine, where again the classification routine is adjusted iterative in view of performance and generality, where the performance is defined as the sum of sensitivity and specificity for classification of each of the ECG sequences to outcome classes ROSC and non-ROSC respectively (column 7, lines 60 – 64; column 8, lines 1 – 4), where the real outcome of shock is known for each ECG sequence, generality is fulfilled as the classification routine has the same performance for an arbitrary composite half of empirical material as for the rest of the empirical material, where measurement of generality and performance is provided in that each ECG sequence in the empirical material is expressed as a m -dimensional vector calculated from energy at the output of m digital filters, where the classification routine classifies each m -dimensional vector to one of the outcome classes ROSC, non- ROSC respectively, where the performance is measured as the sum of sensitivity and specificity of the classification routine, where an arbitrary composite half of empirical material has the same performance as the rest of the empirical material, the optimized algorithm for calculation of the probability figure consists of a matrix having m matrix elements, where

Art Unit: 3762

each matrix element expresses a probability figure, where the probability figure for each matrix element is provided by grouping ECG-sequences which is expressed by approximately identical m-dimensional vectors, where the occurrence of ECG which resulted in ROSC by shock plus the sum of occurrence of ECG which resulted in non-ROSC by shock constitute the probability figure for the matrix element, the m-dimensional matrix together with the filter coefficient constitute the optimized algorithm for calculation of the probability figure (EXAMPLE in its entirety, beginning in column 6 at line labeled EXAMPLE through column 10 ending at line 42).

Regarding Claim 8, Brown discloses the output of an analysis unit is connected to a receiver in the shape of a display unit (Fig. 3).

Regarding Claim 9, Brown discloses a receiver is a defibrillator (Fig. 4).

Regarding Claim 10, Brown discloses a receiver of a probability figure is an algorithm for decision support for a choice of treatment (Fig. 2, element 30).

Regarding Claim 11, Brown discloses an analysis unit identifies periods of positive change in the probability figure together with parameters that characterize the treatment, and passes on the numerical value of the positive change in the probability figure, together with the mean value of each treatment parameter over the period, to a receiver (Fig. 2; TABLES 1 – 4).

Regarding Claim 12, Brown discloses a receiver of a numerical value of a positive change in the probability figure, together with the mean value of each treatment parameter over the period, is a display unit (Fig. 3).

Regarding Claim 13, Brown discloses a receiver of a numerical value of a positive change in the probability figure, together with a mean value of each treatment parameter

Art Unit: 3762

over a period, is an algorithm for decision support for a choice of treatment (Fig. 2, element 30).

Regarding Claim 14, Brown discloses a device for indicating patient specific information and/or specific information regarding a treatment is connected to an analysis unit (Figs. 1 – 2).

8. Claims 1 – 3, 6, 8, 10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Selker et al., U.S. Patent 5,724,983.

Regarding Claim 1, Selker discloses an analysis unit is connected with a module, which is measuring bio-electrical signals from electrodes connected to a patient (Fig. 1), an analysis unit is provided to organize the bio-electrical signals continuous into segments (Figs. 3 and 4), an analysis unit is provided for each segment to calculate a combination parameter that characterizes the condition of the heart (Fig. 3), an analysis unit is provided to by means of comparing for each combination of parameters to find a corresponding combination of parameters from earlier made defibrillator treatments, where there for each combination of parameters is assigned a probability figure, where the probability figure expresses the number of defibrillator shocks that results in ROSC relative to the total number of defibrillator shocks for each combination of parameters (Fig. 3), and an analysis unit has an output for the probability figure (Figs. 1 and 3).

Regarding Claim 2, Selker discloses bio-electrical signals are ECG signals (Fig. 1; column 2, line 54).

Art Unit: 3762

Regarding Claim 3, Selker discloses an analysis unit is provided to calculate the probability figure by means of an algorithm (Figs. 3 – 4; column 3, lines 36 – 39; column 4, lines 39 - 42).

Regarding Claim 6, Selker discloses a calculation unit is connected to a data storage, the calculation unit is storing for each treatment parameters which describe the patient and parameters which describes the treatment, the calculation unit is connected to means for exchange of data, the exchange of data occur on a regular basis towards a central computer, where the calculation unit receives optimized algorithm for calculation of the probability figure, and the computer receives information that is stored in the data storage (Figs. 1, and 3 – 5; column 3, lines 61 – 62; column 9, lines 50 – 58).

Regarding Claim 8, Selker discloses the output of an analysis unit is connected to a receiver in the shape of a display unit (Fig. 1).

Regarding Claim 10, Selker discloses a receiver of a probability figure is an algorithm for decision support for a choice of treatment (column 9, lines 50 – 58).

Regarding Claim 14, Selker discloses a device for indicating patient specific information and/or specific information regarding a treatment is connected to an analysis unit (Fig. 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office Action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown as applied to claim 4 above.

Regarding Claim 5, Brown does not disclose a value of an m-dimensional vector is derived from calculation of flatness. However, it is common knowledge in the art that spectral flatness measure (SFM) is used to calculate a vector because it might help a paramedic in estimating the correct electrophysiological state of a heart in arrest and make the best decision for what kind of treatment to give.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at that time the invention was made to have modified the invention of Brown to derive an m-dimensional vector from calculation of flatness because it is common knowledge in the art that spectral flatness measure (SFM) is used to calculate a vector because it might help a paramedic in estimating the correct electrophysiological state of a heart in arrest and make the best decision for what kind of treatment to give.

Further regarding Claim 5, Brown discloses a value of an m-dimensional vector is derived from calculation of energy, frequency by the centre of gravity and frequency by the maximum point of a power density spectrum, where the power density spectrum is derived from an ECG signal segment (Figs. 5 – 14; column 2, lines 40 – 45).

Conclusion

11. The claims are replete with vague and indefinite language. In addition, it cannot be determined what elements are being positively recited or functionally recited and what functions are being performed by different elements in the claims. Upon correction of

Art Unit: 3762

the 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph rejections, the claims may be rejected again under 35 U.S.C. 112 first and/or second paragraphs and/or 35 U.S.C. 102 or 103 with new art or art of record and the Action made Final.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Terri L. Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-7146.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, between 7:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on 571-272-4955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



TLS

April 25, 2005

25 April 2005

GEORGE R. EVANISKO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

4/25/05